

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. W. VOORHEES,
OF INDIANA,

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JANUARY 9, 1866.

Peace and Obedience to Law are the only Guaranties for the Future which any Government can Require of its People.

WASHINGTON, D. C.:

PRINTED AT THE "CONSTITUTIONAL UNION" OFFICE.

1866.

S P E E C H .

Mr. VOORHEES said:

MR. SPEAKER: As the morning hour has expired, I call up the resolutions submitted by me before the recess, and postponed to this day after the morning hour.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the message of the President of the United States, delivered at the opening of the present Congress, is regarded by this body as an able, judicious, and patriotic State paper.

Resolved, That the principles therein advocated for the restoration of the Union are the safest and most practicable that can now be applied to our disordered domestic affairs.

Resolved, That no States or number of States confederated together can in any manner under their connection with the Federal Union, except by a total subversion of our present system of government; and that the President in enunciating this doctrine in his late message has but given expression to the sentiments of all those who deny the right or power of a State to secede.

Resolved, That the President is entitled to the thanks of Congress and the country for his faithful, wise, and successful efforts to restore civil government, law and order to those States whose citizens were lately in insurrection against the Federal authority; and we hereby pledge ourselves to aid, assist, and uphold him in the policy which he has adopted to give harmony, peace, and union to the country.

MR. STEVENS. I raise the point of order that these resolutions relate to reconstruction, and therefore must go to the joint committee on that subject without debate.

THE SPEAKER. The point is taken entirely too late, in the opinion of the Chair. These resolutions were introduced before the late recess, were considered by the House, and then were postponed without objection to this day, after the morning hour.

MR. VOORHEES. Mr. Speaker, I arise to-day to discuss the annual message of the President. In doing so, I am aware that to the majority on this floor I may appear as a meddler in a family concern. It would seem from the remarks of members here, and the comments of the press in various quarters, that the right to approve or disapprove the policy of the Executive is the exclusive monopoly of the two now belligerent wings of the dominant party. Indeed, I believe it is a new and very dangerous phase of disloyalty for one of the minority to have any opinion at all on the subject. I cannot, however, accept this position of silence and inactivity. Not that I wish to bring any reinforcements which are not sought to the aid of either of the jarring factions on the opposite side of the Chamber, but as a citizen loving my country, and as

the Representative of a large and enlightened constituency, it is my duty and my right here to advocate what in my sight seems best as a remedy for the evils which surround us. And if this sense of public duty leads me to adopt and defend the policy of the Executive, what offense can it be to his real or pretended friends in this body? How indignant we were in the days of our childhood over that dog in the manger, who would neither enjoy the comforts and blessings of life himself, nor let anybody else do so! And here in our mature manhood we behold the same principle of action adopted by a great party. It refuses to endorse the President of its own election, and growls and fiercely shows its teeth if any one else proposes to perform that neglected duty.

Allow me, sir, another preliminary observation. I have no design on this occasion to violate the divine injunction which says, "Thou shalt not steal." A few days ago, when I introduced the very brief and very plain resolutions now under consideration, it was instantly heralded over the country, and especially in the journal conducted by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. RAYMOND,] that I had attempted to "steal the President."

Sir, these hungry spirits pay a poorer compliment to the President than even they do to me, and I will hasten to quiet their miserable apprehensions. It is no part of my purpose to attempt to step between them and the flesh-pots of public patronage. I have no eye on the public crib at which they have fed so long and grown so fat. I do not covet their offices, their rich commissions, their unfathomable contracts, nor anything that is theirs. We of the minority have lived through storm and darkness and fiery persecutions without such assistance to our patriotism, and at this late day we shall not bend our knees because thrift may follow fawning. Our action will be independent, with no desire, like the adroit animal in the fable, to take advantage of the quarrel which now rages among the victors to snatch away the feast over which they are contending. For my part, as in the past, so in the future I shall pursue what I conceive to be the right, indifferent alike to the allurements of reward or the terrors of reproach.

And now, Mr. Speaker, what are the issues which are submitted to the country by the policy of the Executive as declared in his annual message? Are they new, strange, or sinister, that they should be received with indignation and alarm? Is it a document bristling with dangerous dogmas hitherto unheard of in the administration of the Government? Does it read like a wide and violent departure from the teachings of our earlier and happier days? Sir, it has been assailed in both ends of the Capitol by the ablest and oldest veterans of the Republican party, as if every line was leprous and every word filled with contagion and death. Indeed, prior to the meeting of Congress, as the policy of the President was developed in his treatment of the Southern States, we beheld the indications of an organized conspiracy to assail him with the masked face of friendship but with the treacherous sword of Joab. The insidious kiss that betrays is neither new nor respectable in strategic warfare; and men and parties have often heretofore made kindly salutation, "How is it with thee, my brother?" when their poniard's point was seeking a vital spot under the fifth rib.

We heard during all the summer and fall the murmurs and mutterings of angry dissent, as each new development of the President's plan to restore the Government on its ancient foundations, as nearly as now possible, came before the country. And when my friend and colleague, the Speaker of this body, for whom I entertain none but feelings of personal kindness, came to this city as the acknowledged heir-apparent to the position which he now fills so well, what was his language to the public? Did he give the weight of his voice to the Administration? His words were carefully studied, and yet it would be hard to discover from that famous serenade speech that the Executive had done anything at all toward the pacification of the country. He laid down a policy for Congress, but as nearly as possible ignored the policy and even the existence of the President. His position was the sign and the forerunner of the celebrated select committee, created by the magic wand of the conscience-keeper of the majority, the able and veteran leader from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Stevens,]—that potent wand which has evoked from the vasty deep of political agitation more spirits of evil and malignant mischief than generations, I fear, will be able to exorcise and put down. By this movement the whole question of restoration, with entire forgetfulness of the labors and achievements of the Executive, was placed in commission, and intrusted to the keeping of a board of political trade at whose head stands one who asserts that the Union was destroyed by the war, and that it remains so to this day. By this movement we are called upon to transport ourselves back to the chaotic days of last April, and to take no note of time

or events since then. We are asked to ravel to pieces all that the President has done, and to commence the knitting process of re-union for ourselves. The healing principles of the Constitution are, in my judgment, rapidly doing the needed work of restoration, and yet we are at this stage of the process asked to break again the once fractured limbs, to tear agape the half closed wounds, and to cause the whole land to bleed afresh. Sir, I shall stand by the physician who is working the cure, as against that blind and fatal empiricism which first pronounces the patient dead and then commences giving medicine.

Let us indulge ourselves in a retrospect. Let us lift ourselves to a position which history will occupy some generations hence, and then ask and answer the question which is involved in the issue now made against the President because of his conduct and his policy. I am in no sense his partisan. I did not support him for the office which led to his present position. I dreaded the use he would make of power when he attained it. I feared the operations of a character which I had heard represented as strongly tenacious of a sense of personal injury which I knew he had suffered. But since the day on which he took the oath of office I have beheld the public magistrate, not the private man. And who ever, in all the tide of time, became the head of a great nation under circumstances more appalling to the stoutest heart and the most commanding intellect than those which surrounded him? A war whose tremendous blows had shaken both hemispheres had just closed, and night and chaos hovered over the face of the deep. Battles between brethren had been fought which dwarfed and belittle the warlike exploits of all ages, and which startled the invisible world by the flight of disembodied spirits. The people and the States of the whole country, weary, blood-stained, and almost blind from the fury of the conflict, had paused upon an agreement to fight no more. But in that disastrous contest what ancient principles of the Government had escaped profanation? Who had stopped to count how much the object cost for which the wager of battle was joined? Laws, liberties, and constitutions had asserted themselves in vain. And I confess that, as I saw the fierce lightning which civil war engenders strike and shiver again and again the household gods of fireside liberty, and blast almost every sacred fane of American worship, I had my hours of absolute despair—not despair over the unity of our territorial boundaries, but that when those boundaries should be restored they would embrace nothing but the dead, cheerless, and cold ashes of the former bright and glowing fires of freedom. I shrank from the contemplation of a ruined Republic and a triumphant despotism with more unfeigned horror than I ever shrank from the contemplation of death and the grave. And

when the sound of the last cannon died away on the sorrowful and stricken fields of Virginia and the Carolinas he who, at the head of affairs, would breathe into the expiring form of legal liberty the breath of life, and by his touch revive and erect again in form and substance the ancient body of the Republic, although bruised, maimed, and in parts defaced, and requiring time to renew its strength—that man, whoever he may be, and whatever may be his political views on other questions, is, in my eyes, the savior of his country.

Sir, history tells a melancholy story of usurpations at such periods. They are the opportunity of tyrants and mad, impracticable innovators. He who wishes to mount to imperial power on the ruins of civil liberty, or by a change in the form of the Government to carry out schemes of private hate or Utopian speculation, would embrace the month of April, 1865, in American history as the point from which to deal destruction. But starting from that point, what direction did the President pursue? There are many matters of minor detail for which subordinate officials are mainly responsible, which I might wish widely different, but I am now dealing with the main question of restoration. Upon his first utterance he gave notice of the doctrine, then as now, that the American Union had never been broken, and that its States had never ceased to exist. This gave assurance to the country at once that he was a conservative and not a destructive, a restorer of an ancient order of things and not a destroyer in the name of progress and reform. How can I fail to support him in this position, when my own language, March 9, 1864, in the midst of the sound of arms, was as follows? I quote from a speech delivered by me in this House:

"The great leader of the Administration on this floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS], has deliberately here announced, after all our sacrifices, sorrows, and loss, that the Union of our fathers is dead, and that he who attempts its resurrection is a criminal instead of a patriot. He goes further, and admits all the seceded States have ever claimed—their nationality. They have sought in vain in all the four quarters of the earth for recognition. They find it at last at the hands of those who speak for the Administration on this floor."

"Sir, I deny this doctrine. I plant myself on the Constitution, which recognizes an unbroken Union. I shall stand there in every vicissitude of fortune, and if I fall it will be when the people themselves abandon their own Constitution. By the principles of this mighty instrument I expect finally a restoration of the union of the States. Every hour which the party in power prolongs its control of affairs postpones the auspicious day; but as I behold the future it will assuredly come. Material and indestructible interests unite every section except that which prospers on fanaticism. And I here to-day, in the spirit of one who expects and desires his posterity and theirs to live together in the ancient and honorable friendship of their fathers, warn the Southern people not to look forward to separation and independence, but to embrace every opportunity for co-operation with the conservative men of the North, who will aid with their lives, if need be, to secure them all their rights and institutions as free and equal citizens of the United States."

This doctrine is the chief corner-stone of the message, and has invited the attack of the theoretical reform, but practical

disunion. Shall I stop at this day and hour of American history to discuss the right or power of a State to secede? I never entertained such a principle, nor did even many of the principal leaders of the late attempt to establish the confederacy of the South. They asserted the right of revolution and used the organizations of State governments in aid of that movement. But who now requires an argument on this point? Do we not all understand and know that this theory of dead States is now proclaimed simply because its adoption would give better scope to ulterior designs of vengeance and revolutionary destruction?

It is true that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] has been consistent in his devotion to it when he stood almost if not quite alone; but that simply proves that he could foresee at a greater distance than his fellow-laborers the means which would be required to accomplish their party ends when the war ceased. He knows that "dead carcasses," in his own striking language, are more easily carved to pieces, torn limb from limb, and devoured by the hungry maw of confiscation than living States. The dead can make no protest when the mutilating knife is applied. Certain beasts of prey, we are told, prefer to find their quarry ready slain, in order to feast upon it in comfort and repose. And so the radical party of the country would find it easier far to make its unnatural banquet on the rights, privileges, laws, liberties, and property of the South by declaring at once that there is no living political community in all that wide region to exclaim against the enormity. Its reasoning on this point is that it is safer and less troublesome to rob a corpse than it is to pick the pockets of the living. This is the highwayman's doctrine of convenience, introduced here now as a party platform. It is more and worse. It is an assertion that the American Union itself is dead. While it claims that the Southern States have destroyed themselves, yet it admits that, like blind Samson of old, in their dying agonies they seized hold of the pillars and tore the temple in ruins to its very foundations, and that they in their desolation to-day are only a portion of the general wreck. It is notice to the world that the war to restore the Union was an utter failure—that the war is over and yet the Union is rent in twain. We have incurred a debt which would absorb for its payment now one-fourth of all the taxable property in the United States. Blood has flown like the torrents of the mountains, and lives have been swept away like autumn leaves in a storm, and yet neither people nor States, according to the logic which assails the President, have been brought back into the Union to repay these stupendous sacrifices.

But still further. In what attitude before the civilized nations does this pernicious heresy place the Federal Government? If we were waging war on an independent Power, a separate existing

nation, how was it that we refused all negotiations for peace except upon the basis of its utter annihilation? Wars between different civilized Powers are made to repair injuries, to resent insults, or to reclaim rights which have been denied; but there is no law of nations which justifies one Government, because of its superior strength, in inflicting obliteration and murder upon its inferior neighbor. This doctrine is one of barbarism, in which the law of force is the law of right. Much pathetic eloquence and many bitter tears have attested the world's sympathy with Poland, with Hungary, and with poor, poor Ireland, and maledictions attend upon their destroyers; but with what curses of indignation would an enlightened posterity and an impartial history assail us for blotting out by sheer force of arms a nation of our own kindred, who simply desired to possess their own in peace and leave us to do the same! Sir, in every aspect the theory which now controls the majority of this House is fraught with death and disgrace to the Republic. I turn from its contemplation to a more cheerful theme. I will contrast against it the conduct and principles of the Executive, for which, I think, he deserves well at the hands of his countrymen.

What was the wish, the hope, the prayer of every heart not fatally bent on mischief, not an enemy to the human race, when the last of the southern forces laid down their arms? Was it that this bitter period of strife should be prolonged and the fires of hate and malice kept alive forever? Was it that at the close of such a hurricane, with the billows yet swelling in angry commotion around us, we were to start afresh upon the long voyage of political discovery and legislative piracy which the bold mariner from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] and his radical followers now, like Viking robbers of the ancient seas, point out to us? Was it not rather that the vessel should be brought back and quietly and firmly anchored as nearly as possible at her old moorings? Was it not rather that the corner stones, boundary lines, and landmarks of the fathers of the Republic should be traced out and restored? I here assert that when the President closed the temple of Janus, refused to go in search of new principles by which to administer the Government, and extended the hand of friendship and assistance to the crippled and bleeding though living, yes, living States of the South, he met the demands of the popular will and laid claims to the gratitude of the present and the future. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] says such a recognition of their existence coming from "a man of respectable standing is something worse than ridiculous." The American people to-day do not think so, nor will their posterity.

It is contended, however, that the Executive had no power to appoint provisional governors. There are those in

my own party as well as in the other who assert that this was a usurpation. First allow me to observe that a usurpation, even if it be such, to restore, to build up, to give health and strength to the sick and prostrate is far easier to be borne than a usurpation to crush and destroy. But I do not view the conduct of the President as a usurpation at all. By his oath he must enforce the laws. He found States without legal officers and unable to move forward in the channel of their duties. A State of this Union when the Federal laws are no longer obstructed cannot be in passive abeyance. It is an integral part of the Federal body, and if the body be sound there can be no paralysis among its members—they must have vitality; and in the performance of his duty the President used the best means in his power to revive and restore their lawful functions. And much more was I reconciled to the use of this power when I saw on whom the selections of the President fell. And I think, too, that with what I was pleased on this point my radical friends were equally displeased. I lauded such names as Sharkey, Perry, Johnson, and Parsons, and, indeed, all the provisional governors, as bright omens of a good administration, as harbingers of peace and happiness to the Southern people, and of union, peace, and prosperity to the whole country. But then what a military governor of South Carolina for instance, that idol of the radicals, General Butler, would have made! Ay, there is the rub. What fat, unctuous, juicy pickings have been lost to the faithful by this cruel policy of the President! What shoals of loyal, hungry sharks swimming around in these northern waters have been cheated out of their anticipated prey! All the wolves and jackals that wait till the battle is over in order to mangle the dead and the wounded snarled their disappointment and rage at the President, but will now open in a full chorus of joy over the delightful vision which arises before them from the formation of the committee of fifteen. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] saw fit to announce that the position of the President in regard to the Southern States was "not an argument, but a mockery." I partly dissent. I think it is both. It is an unanswerable argument in behalf of the early and true principles of the Government, and it is also an overwhelming and consuming mockery of the bloody designs, avaricious hopes, and greedy expectations of all those who desired when the war was over to rule the people of the South without the restraint of law; to humiliate them with an iron rod; to confiscate their lands and buy them in at nominal prices; to change the proprietorship of the soil and drive into exile and destitution its present owners until a new population should take control and, by the aid of the enfranchised negro, plant a Puritan ascendancy all over the South; who here now unfurl

the banner of "territorial condition," because all these consequences follow its triumph. Sir, this class has been mocked, and God and angels and all good men rejoice in their confusion. Their ascendancy in this land would create a pandemonium of discord and a carnival of all the dark and cruel spirits of hate and revenge for generations to come. The President had them in his mind when in combating the proposition of military governors for the South he says:

"The chief persons who would have followed in the train of the Army would have been dependents on the General Government, or men who expected profit from the miseries of their erring fellow-citizens."

But, Mr. Speaker, allow me to inquire whether this opposition to the Executive is not a new discovery, an afterthought, manufactured for a special purpose on the part of those who adhered to and upheld the late Administration of Mr. Lincoln in regard to the continued existence and vitality of the Southern States during the rebellion. Are they not estopped from this assault, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] says "both by matter of record and matter *in pais*?" In more than a hundred ways and forms, by military orders, in his annual messages, instructions to our foreign ministers, in letters and speeches to his own countrymen, and especially by his numerous proclamations, the late Executive always and at all times recognized the enduring existence of all the States over which the American flag had ever floated. I quote a single passage from the proclamation of emancipation, which, in my judgment, was a usurpation of power, but had at least the merit of not attempting to abolish States:

"That on the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom."

"That the Executive will, on the 1st day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such States shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Sir, this was written and promulgated after the passage of every ordinance of secession; when the party in rebellion occupied and held in a hostile manner a certain portion of territory; had declared their independence; had cast off their allegiance; had organized armies; had commenced hostilities against their former sovereign; and yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his present followers uttered no dissent to its doctrines. It was the subject of indiscriminate praise from those very organs which

now seek to blast and ruin the same policy in the hands of his successor. There is no escape here. The late chief of the great party of the North dealt with American States, the people whereof were in rebellion, and not with a foreign Power subject to conquest; and if his memory is sacred to his followers, they should not insult it by pronouncing his policy a delusion and a mockery ere his untimely tomb is fairly closed.

Sir, I am aware that many on the opposite side of the Chamber do not endorse the destructive theory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but who are nevertheless assisting to carry its results into practice. They deny his premises that the States are dead, but concur in his conclusion that they shall not be represented on this floor. To my mind their position is the worst of all. They embrace a consequence without a cause. They have reached an end which has no beginning. They are standing on a structure which has no foundation. While the premises of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are unsound, yet his logic is true. But those who refuse to follow him and yet deny representation, have neither premises nor logic. If the States are out of the Union of course their Representatives are strangers to us, but if they are in the Union what power can close those doors against them except the power of lawless, revolutionary force? "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers." This is the language of the Federal Constitution. It also declares that "each State shall have at least one Representative." Are these States then "included within this Union?" If they are, how can we deny, in the very teeth of the Constitution, to receive their Representatives? What madness is this which proposes to govern the people of eleven American States, States "included within this Union," without representation? Where on this side of the ocean has been found such a monstrous principle of government? Its adoption would carry us back to the days of King George, and as fatally subvert liberty as if Cornwallis had triumphed on the plains of Yorktown.

But the advocates of this doctrine say that this phase of absolute despotism is only to last for a season; that these States are only to go unrepresented for a few years until guarantees, guarantees for the future, are obtained. Guarantees for the future! This vague term is another political convenience like that of "dead States." Under it each innovator, dreamer, and revolutionist throughout the land can demand and require the fulfillment of all his fantastic desires against the South before he is willing to admit her Representatives. It is the cloak for every higher-law purpose now abroad in the public mind. It is a well-filled arsenal from which to shower confiscation, negro suffrage, reapportion-

ment, proscription of persons, and every other inissile of torture that was ever levelled at an unfortunate people.

Sir, I deny that a State can be refused her representation for a single moment on such grounds. Peace and obedience to law are the only guarantees for the future which any Government can justly require of its citizens. Where is the power in the Constitution whereby anything more can be demanded? Or has that instrument become a dead letter to us because we have been four years in forcing others to obey it? If we are not released from it, let me see the section on the subject of guarantees which authorizes Congress to close its doors in the face of the representatives of the people until they sign deeds of political capitulation.

It may be said that the President himself has required guarantees in his policy of restoration. Even if he did so, I do not understand that he proposed to make their refusal a pretext for violating the Constitution himself. But I have not regarded his advice to the South in the nature of this movement in Congress. On the great question of slavery I hold that the action of the Southern States in adopting the constitutional amendment has been wise and beneficent. The system was destroyed already by the force of arms and the operations of war, but it is better for the future dignity and history of the nation that a fact accomplished of the utmost magnitude should have the sanction of fundamental law. It was a vast step, too, toward a speedy restoration, and that alone is a powerful appeal in favor of the counsel of the Executive and the action of the South.

One other subject has been much canvassed under this new-coined phrase of guarantees for the future. The war debt incurred by the Southern States in their attempt to establish a Confederacy has been shaken in the face of the Northern people to incite them to a policy of distrust and severity. Everybody well knows, of course, that it will never be paid. All history tells us that the debt of a defeated revolution is always lost. The government that contracted it is no more, and the ruined and exhausted people gladly turn their backs on the dead and melancholy past and look forward to the future with new hopes, new ties, and a new destiny. As to the victor in arms ever assuming such a debt, no instance is known in the annals of mankind, and such an idea is not respectable outside of an asylum for the insane. I regarded, therefore, the war debt of the South as fit only for one use—the declamation of demagogues and the malign purposes of political agitators. Hence I voted a few days ago that it should be buried out of sight and out of mind in the most effective and conclusive manner. I did not do so because I wanted a guarantee on that subject, but simply because I wished to remove it as an obstacle in the pathway of re-union, and as

a means of useless and pernicious discord in the future.

But again, as to the right of representation, immediate and without any other guarantee than obedience to the Constitution. I shall now prove that the refusal to admit the southern representatives arises from a sense of power and not of justice; that while the southern people were in arms no position of the kind was assumed by any department of the Government, and that harder terms are now tendered to a defeated than were held out to a defiant enemy. In the proclamation of the late Chief Magistrate, from which I have already quoted, he clearly and explicitly asserts the right of any State, whose people were then in hostility to the General Government, to be represented in the Federal Congress, and announces that he will consider such fact as an evidence that neither the State nor its people are any longer in rebellion. Where, then, was the guarantee doctrine? It had not yet been born. We were then wooing and courting representation because it suited our purposes to do so. We are now repelling it for the same reason. The great proclamation was then akin to the gospels of righteousness. Now I challenge the committee of fifteen to report in its favor. It is deserted in the house of its friends, and I am found defending the only healthy and legal spot in it. But, potent as it was considered, yet it was not the only expression that emanated from the high places of the last Administration, which confounds the philosophers of this new faith. On the 6th of February, 1863, Mr. Seward informs Europe and the civilized world that seats in Congress "are also vacant and inviting the Senators and Representatives of the discontented party who may be constitutionally sent there from the States involved in insurrection." Did these vacant seats invite the Representatives and Senators of a foreign nation with which we were waging a war for annihilation? Did the Secretary of State attach any other condition to the representation of the people then in arms against the Government than attaches to the representation of every other portion of the American people? He only asked that it might be constitutionally done, and this requirement is of universal application to the whole country. It means no more in Georgia than it does in New York; it means no more in Virginia than it does in Massachusetts. It interpolates nothing upon the practice of the Government under the Constitution from the hour of its birth down to the day on which an inquisition was sued out in this House, in the shape of a committee of fifteen, in order to discover some means of adopting the old British system of colonial bondage.

But, sir, it may, in answer to these citations, be said that it is not within the province of the executive department of the Government to determine the question of representation in the legislative department. But has not Congress it-

self made a record on this subject which it cannot ignore and which the majority dare not face? Has it not officially, over and over again, in both branches, assumed the very position which it now seeks with such flagrant assurance to repudiate? The cry is now that we must look to Congress for our policy of restoration. This place has suddenly become a citadel of wisdom, power, and dominion. It is a city of refuge, where all the disappointed spoliators, insane anarchists, bloody Jacobins, promoters of vengeance, disturbers of the peace, self-constituted saints who imagine themselves in partnership with the Almighty to assist Him in punishing the sins of the world, where law-breakers and revolutionists of every shade and color now flee to escape from the wise, successful, and constitutional policy of the President. "To your tents, O Israel!" was the ancient and legitimate cry of alarm. "Look to Congress, look to Congress!" now rings out on the air as a call to battle in behalf of chaos, disorder, and interminable woes. The populace of France, tossed in a tumultuous delirium of hate, drunken with blood, dethroning Deity and reverencing a harlot, shouted, "Look to the Assembly, look to the Assembly!" where the Mountain murdered the Girondists, and where Robespierre, Marat, and Saint Just planned, in the name of public virtue, the destruction of human life and of human society. But, sir, if we must "look to Congress," let me show the wistful gazers a picture of congressional action which will fill their hearts with dismay, and which Congress itself cannot to-day behold without feelings of humiliation and shame over its present position.

Did I not serve here in this Hall during the fury of the rebellion, when the flames of war scorched the very front of the heavens, with Representatives from the State of Louisiana? Were they not admitted to the "vacant seats" which invited their return by the very men who now stand like surly sentries at these doors and answer their hailing sign of entrance either with the response of "Dead States" or "Guarantees?" Was Tennessee destroyed or were her people entitled to no voice here because of her ordinance of secession? Sir, her name was called here during more than half the period of the war, and the representatives of her people answered to their names in both ends of the Capitol. The gentleman who in vain sought even a recognition of his own existence in this body when the present Congress was organized [Mr. MAYNARD] was then here with the full sanction of the same political majority which now spurns him from the door of its caucus room, and drives him from the protection which the escutcheon of his glorious State, under the administration of law, affords its Representatives in Congress. Shall we now assert that at that time Tennessee was a portion of a foreign Government? Shall we then as the next

step of supreme absurdity declare the President of the United States himself an unnaturalized foreigner, a captive to our lance and spear, entitled doubtless to kind treatment, but in no sense a citizen of the United States, inasmuch as he never expatriated himself from the alien and hostile province of Tennessee, and never acknowledged himself subdued to the embraces of the Federal flag as the symbol of a separate nationality? I am prepared to hear even this miserable libel on American institutions asserted. Nothing is allowed to stand in the way of fanaticism. Its purposes are inexorable, and its devotees often deem themselves in truth and honesty the philosophers of their age; but Frederick the Great made a wise observation when he said, "If I wanted to ruin one of my provinces I would make over its government to the philosophers." Their theories are always in advance of their times; and in practical sense and actual utility they meet neither the requirements of the past, present, or future. The philosophers of Congress at least contradict themselves at very short stages of progress, and give no evidence of either ability or consistency. Why, sir, the records of this body, as well as of the Senate, will show that Virginia, too—Virginia, whose fiery and lofty crest shone in the very front of the rebellion, whose plains were its battle-fields, and in whose soil so many of its heroes lie buried—was here as a State when the roar of her hostile cannon could be heard on Capitol Hill. Those who claimed to be her representatives came and they were received. They were required to give no pledges then for the future good behavior of their constituents, nearly all of whom were obeying the orders of General Lee. Then they were to be trusted without guarantees; but now that peace has been restored, and there is not an armed hand in all her borders to dispute the Federal authority, her people are much more dangerous and the presence of their Representatives here would give a fatal blow to the public safety! Such is the miserable position to which the engineers of this new movement are reduced!

Mr. DEMING. Will my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] inform this House when he thinks the right to representation here from these States commenced? Did it commence at Antietam, at Gettysburg, or when did it commence?

Mr. VOORHEES. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. DEMING.] But as my time is getting short, I trust I shall be excused from further interruption. My answer is, "Peace and obedience to law are the only guarantees for the future which any Government can require of its people." And when peace and obedience to law reign among any portion of the American people, I hold that they are entitled to representation here.

Mr. DEMING. Then I suppose it

will be necessary for the gentleman to show that obedience to law exists at this time in the reclaimed territories?

Mr. VOORHEES. Undoubtedly. I think the President and General Grant have shown that fact.

But one step further in this congressional record. As if to forever settle the construction which should be placed upon the condition of the Southern States, and their right to representation, Congress enacted and the President approved a law on the 4th of March, 1862, which I here read :

CHAP. XXXVI.—An act fixing the number of the House of Representatives from and after the third March, eighteen hundred and sixty-three. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That from and after the third day of March, eighteen hundred and sixty-three, the number of members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall be two hundred and forty-one; and the eight additional members shall be assigned one each to Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Vermont, and Rhode Island.

In order to obtain the number of two hundred and forty-one Representatives as contemplated by this law, every Southern State whose citizens were in revolt must have been represented according to her population. What more can I do than to make this statement? What argument could add to its binding force? If men will repudiate to-day what they did yesterday, if they refuse to be bound by their own principles declared in the solemn form of a law, if the highest precedents of their own official action fall without force upon their ears, then, indeed, they are beyond the power of reason and callous to the reproach and derision of the world.

Sir, the most melancholy phase of corrupted and fallen human nature is its selfish tenacity to the low purposes of the hour. In their headlong pursuit it spurns the fixed principles and everlasting laws of the universe from its sordid pathway. It scoffs at wisdom that is "hoary and white with old," and jeers the venerable experiences of ages if they arise as obstacles to its immediate gratification. Constitutions, laws, and sacred ordinances are lighter than cobwebs in the way of its consuming desires. Even the dread Jehovah, who made man and the code of divinity which claims his obedience, is but dimly remembered when the prize of the heart's dearest passion lies close and tempting to our hands. Our line of vision is on the level before us. We bow to the earth and worship its transient spoils while the stars which sail over our heads and beckon us to celestial duties and betoken eternity, go unheeded in their grandeur. We hear the siren voice of the moment, but fail to catch the loftier harmony of the eternal spheres. Who has fathomed the dark and mysterious depths of his own motives? The rules of right rise or sink as they can be made subservient to our interests, our hopes, our loves, and our hates. The merchant prince of to-day adopts a new principle of trade from yesterday, because his harvest of profit

will be richer and his chambers of wealth enlarged. The rulers and legislators of nations do the same. Napoleon worshipped with the faith of a Moslem at the Pyramids, when he dreamed of reviving and reigning on the throne of the Pharaohs. He imprisoned the anointed successor of St. Peter when the unappeasable rage of his ambition strove for the empire of Europe. He died with the consecrated wafer on his lips when he sought the salvation of his soul in the midst of the storm at Helona. Cromwell commenced his career in the name of the Lord, the champion of liberty, and the enemy of kings. His present purposes were gained by those fair and specious pretensions, but he passed from the earth as the first of an imperial dynasty, with every vestige of civil and religious toleration destroyed, and every evidence of free government swept from the British empire. David, the king, the statesman, the warrior, and the man of letters, yielded to the temptation of a beautiful but momentary vision, darkened his fame with cowardly and cruel murder, and corrupted his line with the offspring of a twofold crime. Even the primeval parents of the human race, who had communed face to face with the eternal Presence, and whose daily guests in the bowers of Eden were the angels and misistering spirits from heaven, looked no higher nor further than the branches of the tree where the forbidden fruit hanging in fatal splendor promised an immediate enjoyment and the fulfillment of immediate desires. And are these mournful instances in the sad philosophy of human nature to bring us no lesson of warning in the discharge of our present duties? Shall we grasp the close, proximate pleasure of power and revenge in defiance of all the principles of the Republic, in violation of its Constitution, and in contempt of all our own deliberate and solemn committals, with no thought or care for the future, which will be filled with misery, disaster, and shame? It may be so. The present is more powerful here than the past or the future. The majority in Congress as utterly ignores its own record of the last four years as if it was blotted from the memory of man; and to attain an unlawful result would launch the people of this Government on a future destitute of constitutional protection.

Mr. Speaker, I shall here rest the discussion of the relation which the Southern States bear to the Federal Government, and their right to representation in these Halls. It was one of the very few great questions that arose during the war in which both the political parties of the North agreed. The principle that the Union was unbroken was declared in the platforms of all the conventions, from the smallest to the greatest; and now that its denial has become the corner-stone of a new and aggressive faith I have found but little difficulty in showing that the doctrines of the Constitution and the highest official

actions of every department of the Government alike invoke us to resist the bold advances of this baleful and destructive heresy. There are other points, however, on which I wish briefly to dwell in connection with my support of the principles enunciated in the annual message of the President.

Second only in importance to the mighty question of Union and constitutional government is the financial policy which, through the approaching generations of sweat, toil, and pain, shall govern the tax-payers of this deeply-indebted nation. Our public debt has assumed proportions so vast and threatening that thinking men shudder in its contemplation. There would be no profit now in inquiring whether it might have been less and yet the Union preserved. It is a fixed reality, and fastened upon us beyond the power at least of present rescue. I have decided opinions which apply to the past, and which I have expressed, and which I shall never recall. I now approach the future in connection with results over which I had no control, but which none the less impose duties incident to the position which I hold. These duties I shall discharge with not one partisan or selfish motive, in the interest of every tax-payer and every son of labor in the whole land.

Sir, how long can the inequalities of our present revenue system be borne? How long will the poor and the laborers pay tribute to the rich and the idle? We have two great interests in this country, one of which has prostrated the other. The past four years of suffering and war has been the opportune harvest of the manufacturer. The looms and machine shops of New England and the iron furnaces of Pennsylvania have been more prolific of wealth to their owners than the most dazzling gold mines of the earth. I might here stop and dwell on statistics and figures, but the public mind is already familiar with their startling import. They are the result of class legislation, of a monopoly of trade established by law. It may be said that they indicate prosperity. Most certainly they do; but it is the prosperity of one who obtains the property of his neighbor without any equivalent in return. The present law of tariff is being rapidly understood. It is no longer a deception, but rather a well-defined and clearly-recognized outrage. The agricultural labor of the land is driven to the counters of the most gigantic monopoly ever before sanctioned by law. From its exorbitant demands there is no escape. The European manufacturer is forbidden our ports of trade for fear he might sell his goods at cheaper rates and thus relieve the burdens of the consumer. We have declared by law that there is but one market into which our citizens shall go to make their purchases, and we have left it to the owners of the market to fix their own prices. The bare statement of such a principle foreshadows at once the con-

sequences which flow from it. One class of citizens, and by far the largest and most useful, is placed at the mercy, for the necessities as well as luxuries of life, of the fostered, favored, and protected class to whose aid the whole power of the Government is given. Will not such a privilege be abused? Can avaricious human nature withstand such a temptation? Is it any wonder or mystery that the farmer and the mechanic are paying more than fourfold the actual value of every article which supplies their daily wants and necessities?

But it is claimed that this system is a means of revenue to assist in the payment of the public debt. Even if this be true, its iniquity would be infinitely aggravated. I would rather be directly robbed than forced to assume, in the name of justice and right, the burdens and obligations of others more able to meet them than I am. Must the western people, because they are consumers and not manufacturers, be compelled by indirection to meet a large proportion of the debts of their fellow-citizens in other sections? Sir, this question must be met. It is in the minds and mouths of all our laboring classes in the West; and they will hail with general joy the fact that the President has declared in their favor and against the policy of their bloated and plethoric oppressors. I quote from his message:

"Now, in their turn, the property and income of the country should bear their just proportion of the burden of taxation, while in our impost system, through means of which increased vitality is incidentally imparted to all the industrial interests of the nation, the duties should be so adjusted as to fall most heavily on articles of luxury, leaving the necessities of life as free from taxation as the absolute wants of the Government, economically administered, will justify."

It is true that had I the power I would go further than this position of the Executive. Free trade with all the markets of the world is the true theory of government. No nation should prevent its citizens from buying wherever their hard earnings will buy most and go furthest. If a Hottentot can make and sell a bolt of cloth, or of muslin, or calico, cheaper than a New England Senator, who a few days since asked for increased protection to his manufactories, [Mr. SPRAGUE,] it is the right of any laborer in this broad land to pass by the civilized but rapacious Senator and obtain from the barbarian a better return for the sweat of his brow. For revenue I would look to the actual wealth of the country, and make it contribute accordingly. But this just and philosophic system of trade and government is not now within our reach, and I am content to accept the recommendation of the President to adjust the present impost system to the basis of revenue alone and not of protection. It is a step in the direction of true and practical reform—a reform in favor of that mighty branch of industry on which all nations depend for their wealth and power. It is a manly and honest blow aimed at a monopoly as arrogant, avaricious, and deaf to justice as the British East In-

dia corporation under Hastings or Clive. Nor is it any new doctrine. The people will hail it as a familiar friend of their former and happier days, and endorse it as they did then.

In close and immediate connection, however, with this branch of the message, the President has uttered another sentence on which the eye of the toiling, sunburnt tax-payer will linger long and gratefully. At the close of the weary day, as he counts up his feeble gains, looks into the heavy expenses of his family and his farming under high protective tariff prices, and shudders at the thought of the approaching tax-gatherer, knowing that for him and his hard-earned substance there is no escape, he will in his heart thank the man who as President wrote the following lines:

"No favored class should demand freedom from assessment, and the taxes should be so distributed as not to fall unduly on the poor, but rather on the accumulated wealth of the country."

Sir, is there a favored class in our midst that demands freedom from assessment? Are there those who, at such a time as this, demand that their property shall be exempted from the burdens of taxation? Are there American citizens, who boast loudest of their love of country, who will pay nothing to relieve it from debt? Is there an honest man in America who wishes his neighbor to pay his taxes as well as his own? Where is the "accumulated wealth of the country," which shirks its just responsibility and suffers the taxes to "fall unduly on the poor?" Where is this criminal delinquent which grinds the face of poverty and absorbs the widow's mite, in order that it may escape its own just dues and increase its hoarded gains?

[Here the hammer fell.]

MR. SMITH. I move that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] have his time extended to enable him to conclude his remarks.

No objection was made.

MR. VOORHEES. I return to the House my acknowledgements for the favor they have extended to me.

Sir, more than one-tenth of the taxable property of the United States demands and has obtained in the hands of a favored class freedom from assessment. The enormous capitalist who has invested all his means in the bonds of the Government thus relieves the principal of his vast estate from taxation. He feels no concern for the movements of the tax-gatherer except as he goes forth and returns to him with the interest on his bonds, which the hands of honest toil pour into his coffers. Is this "equal and exact justice to all men, and exclusive privileges to none?" It is claimed, however, by the friends of this moneyed monopoly that the bonds of the Government are a sacred obligation and must not be touched; that they were purchased by their present holders out of pure patriotism, and that their freedom from assessment is but a proper token of the nation's gratitude. Patriotism was

said by the great Dr. Johnson to be the last refuge of a scoundrel. It is now made the refuge of wealthy non-tax-payers, who convert their taxable property into Government securities, in order to evade their honest obligations. The idea that they have made these purchases from other than the ordinary motive of pecuniary profit only provokes contempt. They bought at a heavy discount, owing to the condition of the currency. They paid about fifty cents on the dollar, and now hold them at par, and receive interest at their face.

But it is said that when these bonds were thrown upon the market there was a guarantee that they should not be taxed. Is an act of Congress at the last session a guarantee that another and a different one on the same subject will not be passed at this? Do we live in the days of the Medes and Persians, when it was an offense punishable with death to propose to change a law once enacted? Does any man of sense predicate his business transactions on such a theory? Did the capitalists who are now to be so tenderly relieved from taxation make their investments innocently supposing that an everlasting perpetuity attached to the legislation of this most versatile, fluctuating, and changeable body? If they did, it is very wonderful how men of so little intelligence could have so much money. No, sir, they calculated all the risks of profit and loss, and every contingency of the future, as closely as Shylock did on the Rialto, assured in any event that their ventures would come home to them like richly freighted argosies after a prosperous voyage at sea; still better pleased, however, if they could have judgment forever on the inhuman bond which gives them freedom from assessment and exacts in their favor the pound of flesh nearest the heart of the toiling multitude.

I have listened to appeals in favor of this class, on account of their timely and self-sacrificing services, until I have almost imagined that we dwelt in a new Arcadia, where such a thing as self-interest was unknown. They loaned moneys on good securities and high rates of usance, and therefore the dusty, weary plowman in the field must pay their taxes for them, and be thankful to God for so sweet a privilege! Yes, and even the soldier, crippled in the shock of battle, with the old flag over his head, returning home to find poverty and want at his hearth-stone, must hear these speculators of Wall street hailed as the saviors of the country; and likewise without a murmur scuffle hard with the world, perhaps on crutches, to pay their debts as well as his own. The nation's gratitude takes a strange turn at this point. It lavishes its gifts, its garlands, and its favors on the money-changers of the temple, and causes the defenders of the Government at the cannon's mouth to pay tribute to their monstrous greed. Sir, there are few parallels in the wide annals of all the nations of the earth to

such frightful injustice and inequality; and wherever they are found the people have been at last avenged upon their extortionate oppressors. The patricians of Rome, an aristocracy founded upon wealth, at different periods ground the plebians, who labored at home and bore arms in the field, with debt and unequal taxation; but there was always a point at which the elements of revolution darkened the sky, and the privileged classes were compelled to yield to the untitled millions. State and Church in France had for ages loaded their favorites and parasites with riches and honors, and the peasantry with burdens, until the frenzied insanity of 1790 burst forth, and the whole fabric of government and of human society was involved in one common conflagration and ruin. Sir, there is but one pathway of safety and honor for Governments to pursue in their domestic policy. They must administer justice to their citizens in the spirit and the letter of equality; and there is no instance in the history of nations where class legislation and legalized monopolies have not overthrown the prosperity of every interest, and destroyed public liberty. I therefore endorse the policy of the President's annual message on this great and vital question. Sprung from the loins of the people, they will greet him as their champion. His life has been a battle in their behalf against privilege and oppression, and he has shown that in his proud eminence he has not lost for them his ancient love and care. Declamation on the dignity of labor in the abstract is a cheap indulgence. We listened to it a few evenings since in this hall, from the eloquent lips of one whose soft hand never did an hour's toil, and who preaches a fashionable gospel at ten thousand a year. But labor finds its true dignity when its rights and interests are defended in high places by one who has felt all its privations and sufferings, and knows by experience "the simple annals of the poor." Let the public debt be paid, but let it be paid honestly and by all. I advocate no repudiation, but I advocate equality in striving to meet its terrible demands. Its exactions will be sufficiently sore even when the whole wealth of the land is brought to the receipt of custom. It will be more intolerable than the requirements which the Egyptian masters laid upon their Hebrew slaves, if only a portion of the people have to meet it all. I implore this Congress, then, to accept these wise recommendations of the Executive. Adjust the present tariff so that the whole labor of the country shall no longer be taxed on the necessities of life for the benefit of a single section. Repeal the law by which a favored class obtains freedom from assessment. Bring the accumulated wealth of the country to the aid of the poor in paying the national debt. Do these things, and you will lift cruel and galling burdens from the shoulders of honest labor, and convince the country that you have some regard for

an equality of rights and privileges among American citizens as well as between the different races in our midst.

Mr. Speaker, I have thus far reviewed and discussed, as I understand them, the leading features of the domestic policy of the Executive. The success of some portions of this policy remains wholly with the future. Upon the leading measure, however, of a restoration of the States to Union and harmony, an important chapter in history has already been written. Has it been a success or a failure? I have tried it by the high standards of right, justice, constitutional law, and precedent. I submit it now to another test, on which it is bitterly assailed by those who yet claim to be the only friends of the Administration. Those who perform their duties of friendship toward the President by malignant denunciations of his policy are now engaged in impressing the public mind with the belief that he has accomplished nothing worthy of acceptance by the people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] pronounces his plan of restoration impracticable and untenable. He not only speaks for himself on this point, but also for everybody else. He says that "very few now consider" the administrative position a tenable one. An arrogant Senator in the other end of the Capitol, pronounces the whole thing a fraud, a white-washing process, by which sins and crimes are connived at and hid from the public gaze. Adventurous members of this House have crowded themselves into the presence of the Executive, and with exquisite delicacy assured him that, with their constituencies, they think his plan of restoration not likely to give success to his administration, and that, after an uninterrupted trial of seven months, his efforts to reorganize the rebel States and restore them to the Union must be recognized as a failure. Then with profuse protestations of true friendship they modestly ask him to step quietly to one side, not to lift a finger of interference, not open his lips in remonstrance, while they smash to pieces all his well-ordered plans, and kick to the ground with their vandal feet his almost completed structure of Union and peace.

Sir, this class of dissatisfied spirits is to be found in every age. It is composed of boding birds of evil omen. It is their mission to destroy, not to build up. The borer in the trees of the forest, the worm in the heart of the flower, the wolf in the farmer's sheepfold, the tiger in the traveler's encampment by night, all pursue their trade of destruction and mark their career with ruin. But no useful thing ever grew from their labors. And like these beings in the animal world, created to destroy, so there are unhappy members of the human family, who never beheld the fair and beautiful creation of another's wisdom without an irresistible longing to strew the earth with its broken fragments. To them I make no appeal in behalf of that policy which has cleared

away the wreck of a gigantic fraternal war, laid anew the foundations of government throughout an extent of country more vast than the most powerful kingdoms of Europe, revived confidence and hope in the breasts of a despairing people, and won for its author the respect and admiration of the civilized nations of both hemispheres. I make my appeal to the disinterested, impartial, and enlightened masses of the country, without regard to lines of party distinction. They have witnessed the patient labors of the President, and since this Congress convened they have beheld their grand fulfillment. Those wandering stars from the azure field of the flag, those discontented Pleiades that shot madly from their spheres, have one by one reilluminated their rays at the great center of light and of glory. The whole land wept when the beautiful sisterhood was broken. The wall of the heart-broken over the pallid face of the beloved and untimely dead is not more full of anguish than were the hearts of those who love their fellow-man when many of our most brilliant planets denied the law of gravitation and struck defiantly out upon orbits of their own. The sword that was drawn by all Christian hands, more in sorrow than in anger, hangs peacefully in its scabbard on the wall. Each section has its reminiscences of sublime devotion, of grief, and of glory. These are the brave heart's dearest treasure, and until

"The good knights are dust,"

they will be hallowed as the devotee hallows the rites of his religion. But peace under the policy of the Executive is celebrating "her victories no less renowned than war." The shining symbols of the revolted race are over our heads. State after State, kindly assisted by the paternal hand of the President, comes to take its place beneath its ancient coat of arms. They cluster around these vacant seats that have so long invited them in vain. They are welcomed by the President as Israel's greatest king welcomed the warlike son of Ner, whose standard had waved twice four years in rebellion.

Let Congress imitate his example and mark the opening of the new year as an era of perfect reunion and a season of universal joy. "Let oblivion's curtain fall" upon the doleful tragedies of the past. Bury the animosities of a civil war. Take no counsel from their baleful whisperings. Hate is the basest principle of human action. They who have made laws and ruled nations upon motives of vengeance are the monsters whom all history curses with an unbroken voice. The long and deadly proscriptive lists of Sylla and Marius, Tiberius, and Clodius, gave the names of their victims to the compassion and sympathy of the world, while an immortality of infamy clings unceasingly to those who took private revenge in the name of the public good. Charity for the errors, the follies, and the crimes of the whole family of imperfect man is the leading virtue in the breasts of lawgivers and rulers. Those who have been guided by its sweet angelic influences constitute the glory of the firmament in the annals of mankind. Cyrus, Scipio, and Washington command the love and veneration of ages more by the forbearance, magnanimity, and clemency of their character than by the renown of their military achievements. The savage chief may strike his enemy prostrate and powerless at his feet. It is an attribute of divinity which lifts him up and makes him a friend. When Pericles paused upon the opening threshold of eternity and in his dying moments reviewed the events of his great life, he consoled his parting spirit and rested the chief glory of his reign upon the fact that he had never caused a citizen of Athens to shed a tear. From this hour may this Government dry up the tears of its citizens! May no more hearts be wrung with the gloom of the prison or the anguish of death! May the two sections meet again as kindred and friends! The angel of concord will then stir the healing waters for them both; and renewing their glorious youth together, the future of the American Union will be filled with the love and praise of all its citizens.